



II. Principles of evaluating proposals submitted under the call for research projects carried out by researchers at the beginning of their career, holding no doctorate degree – “PRELUDIUM.”

- **Has the proposal been written with all due diligence?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.
- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.
- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research?²¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.
- **Does the project meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

A. EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT (WEIGHTING 75%)

A.1. EVALUATION OF PLANNED RESEARCH OR PROJECT TASKS (WEIGHTING 60%)

- 5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/journals of the highest academic rank.
- 4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/journals for a given field.
- 3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals.
- 2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.
- 1 Poor . There is a small chance of publishing the project results.
- 0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND ITS IMPACT FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/DISCIPLINE (WEIGHTING 15%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research:**

¹ This question applies at the first stage of the merit-based evaluation.

² Basic research is defined as experimental or theoretical endeavours undertaken primarily to gain new knowledge of the foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without concern for direct commercial use (art. 2(3)(a) of the act of 30th April 2010 on the principles of funding science (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 87).



- 3 The project is innovative.
- 1 The project has innovative elements.
- 0 The project has no innovative elements.
- **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline:**
 - 3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
 - 1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
 - 0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline or the project has been submitted to a wrong review panel.

Justification:

B. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF TEAM MEMBERS (WEIGHTING 20%)

B.1. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in renowned academic press/journals:**
 - 5 Outstanding achievements of the Principal Investigator.
 - 4 Very good achievements of the Principal Investigator.
 - 3 Substantial achievements of the Principal Investigator.
 - 2 Modest achievements of the Principal Investigator.
 - 1 The Principal Investigator has no academic achievements.

Justification:

B.2. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PI SUPERVISOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **scientific achievements of the PI supervisor, including publications in academic press/ journals:**
 - 5 Outstanding. The PI supervisor is one of the world's top researchers in their particular field.
 - 4 Very good. The PI supervisor is an internationally recognised expert in their particular field.
 - 3 Good. The PI supervisor is internationally recognised in the field.
 - 2 Moderate. The PI supervisor has national recognition in the field.
 - 1 Modest. The PI supervisor lacks recognition in the field.
 - 0 The PI supervisor has no academic achievements.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, the structure of the research team, research facilities etc.:**



- 3 Very good.
- 2 Good.
- 1 Poor.
- 0 The project is not feasible.

Justification:

- **Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regards to the subject and scope of the research?**¹
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.
- **Does the proposal meet the criteria allowing for its re-submission in a subsequent edition of the PRELUDIUM and OPUS calls?**³
 - yes
 - no

JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

³ Settled by the Expert Team at the first stage of the merit-based evaluation.